



IFW

Docket No.: 243203US2RD

**OBLON**  
**SPIVAK**  
**McCLELLAND**  
**MAIER**  
**NEUSTADT**  
P.C.

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

ECKHARD H. KUESTERS  
(703) 413-3000  
EKUESTERS@OBLON.COM

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22313

RE: Application Serial No.: 10/670,279

Applicants: Hideki SATAKE

Filing Date: September 26, 2003

For: SEMICONDUCTOR DEVICE AND METHOD OF  
MANUFACTURING THE SAME

Group Art Unit: 2814

Examiner: PHAM, L.

SIR:

Attached hereto for filing are the following papers:

#### PROVISIONAL ELECTION

Our check in the amount of \$0.00 is attached covering any required fees. In the event any variance exists between the amount enclosed and the Patent Office charges for filing the above-noted documents, including any fees required under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 for any necessary Extension of Time to make the filing of the attached documents timely, please charge or credit the difference to our Deposit Account No. 15-0030. Further, if these papers are not considered timely filed, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 for the necessary extension of time. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Eckhard H. Kuesters

Registration No. 28,870

Customer Number

**22850**

(703) 413-3000 (phone)  
(703) 413-2220 (fax)

DOCKET NO: 243203US2RD



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

IN RE APPLICATION OF

HIDEKI SATAKE : EXAMINER: PHAM, L.

SERIAL NO: 10/670,279 :

FILED: SEPTEMBER 26, 2003 : GROUP ART UNIT: 2814

FOR: SEMICONDUCTOR DEVICE AND  
METHOD OF MANUFACTURING THE  
SAME

PROVISIONAL ELECTION

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22313

SIR:

In response to the election requirement dated November 24, 2004, Applicant provisionally elect with traverse Group II, Claims 1-4, drawn to a semiconductor device, classified in class 257, subclass 369, further examination on the merits. Applicant reserves the right to file one or more divisional applications directed to the non-elected invention.

Furthermore, while the Election Requirement asserts that the application contains claims to patentably distinct inventions, MPEP § 803 states the following:

If the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the Examiner must examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to distinct or independent inventions.

Although the outstanding Official Action identifies different search classifications, it is believed that the claims of the present application would have to be searched in a handful of sub-classes. Furthermore, since electronic searching is commonly performed, a search may be made of a large number of, or theoretically all, subclasses without substantial additional

effort. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully traverse the Restriction Requirement on the grounds that a search and examination of the entire application would not place a *serious* burden on the Examiner, whereas it would be a serious burden on Applicants to prosecute and maintain separate applications.

Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the requirement to elect a single group be withdrawn, and that a full examination on the merits of Claims 1-17 be conducted.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Eckhard H. Kuesters  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 28,870

I:\ATTY\EHK\AMEND-RESPONSES\0039\24s\243203US-PE.DOC